

## REMARKS

### Allowable Subject Matter.

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating allowable subject matter in Claims 15 through 21.

### Drawings.

The present Office Action indicates that previously corrected drawings are approved. Applicants have submitted formal drawings under a separate transmittal.

### Specification

The present Office Action objects to the number of words in the abstract and the phraseology. Applicants have amended the abstract to be 150 words and have replaced the word "said" with "the".

### Claim Objections

The present Office Action objects to the language "adapted to" in Claims 4 -10 and 13. Applicants have amended the Claims to remove objected "adapted to" language.

### 112 Rejections

Claims 4-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most clearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. In previous responses, Applicants respectfully disagreed that the original phrase "during a first stage" and "during a second stage" are indefinite and Applicants respectfully assert that the phrase is not used in a context contrary to what one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would understand. In an effort to satisfy the Examiner's previous concerns the Applicants amended Claim 4 to indicate "from a first stages". In a further effort to address the Examiner's concerns Applicants have amended Claim 4 to indicate "at a first sage" and "at a second stage".

### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Li, Hehching Harry (US 6023778 A). Applicants have reviewed the Li reference and, for the following rationale, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by the Li reference.

In the Response to Arguments section of the present Office Action the Examiner indicates that nowhere does Claim 1 teach a notification to a flip flop and does not see

how the Applicants arguments are relevant. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider the rejection of Claim 1 since the comments in the current Office Action appear to indicate the Examiner is now satisfied that that flip flop 91 of Li is not a staging component as claimed in the present application.

Applicants respectfully asserts that in previous Office Actions and again in this Office Action on page 6 line 5 the Examiner attempts to draw a correlation between a staging component of the present application and the flip flop 91 of Li. When Applicants respectfully contend that "Li does not teach that the output of OR gate 94 provides any notification to "flip flops 91" [Fig 4A does not show any connection of the OR gate 94 output to "flip flops 91"] and does not teach the "flip flops 91" doing anything based upon the output of OR gate 94", Applicants are respectfully addressing the Examiner's previous and current (again on page 6 line 5) basis for rejection. If the Examiner is satisfied that flip flop 91 of Li is not a staging component, then Applicants respectfully assert that the Li reference does not teach a staging component as claimed in the present application, and as such Claim 1 is allowable.

Applicants respectfully assert Claim 3 is allowable as depending from an allowable independent Claim 1.

### 103 Rejections

The present Office Action indicates Claim 2, 4 -14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Li, (US 6023778 A). Applicants respectfully assert that claims 2, and 4-14 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 1.

Applicants have amended Claim 11. For reasons presented above and previously with regard to Claim 11 and Claim 1, Applicants respectfully assert that Li does not teach nor render obvious a scan test enable signal assertion system as recited in the newly amended claim 11, including:

a scan test enable trigger sensing component for providing an assertion or deassertion notification when logical values of a trigger signal captured at multiple stages provide an indication to begin a scan test enable signal assertion or deassertion; and

a staging component coupled to said scan test enable trigger sensing component, said staging component for advancing said logical values of said trigger signal through a plurality of stages in accordance with a progression signal and issuing an asserted or deasserted scan test enable signal based upon said assertion or deassertion notification from said scan test enable trigger sensing component.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 12 through 13 are allowable as depending from allowable independent Claim 11.

Conclusion

In light of the above-listed amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the remaining Claims. The examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO

Date: 2/19, 2004



John F. Ryan  
Reg. No. 47, 050  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060